

08/317,349

10/04/94

CSU


UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

 Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
 Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

 STEPHEN G. RUDISILL
 ARNOLD, WHITE & DURKEE
 P.O. BOX 4433
 HOUSTON, TX 77210

2620	EXAMINER
05/02/96	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

7

DATE MAILED:

 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
 COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 2/1/96 ☐ This action is made final.

 A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
 Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-59 are pending in the application.
 Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☒ Claims 11-21, 33-49 and 51 are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-10, 22-32, 50 and 52-59 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

Art Unit: 2606

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-59 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

3. Claims 1-7, 10, 22-28, 32 and 52-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jones et al [U. S. Pat. No. 4,114,804] cited by Applicant in view of DiBlasio [U. S. Pat. No. 4,313,598].

As to claims 1 and 22:

Jones et al discloses a method and apparatus for authenticating documents, comprising:

- an ultraviolet light source for illuminating a document to be tested (Fig. 1c, it. 71; col. 5, lines 18-33);

Art Unit: 2606

- means for detecting light reflected by said document and generating an output signal responsive to the reflected light (Fig. 1c, it. 73; col. 5, lines 34-42 and col. 6, lines 38-48); and

- means for determining the authenticity of said document based on the output signal (Fig. 3b; col. 6, line 38 - col. 8, line 35).

Although Jones et al does not explicitly teaches that the sensor 73 is an ultraviolet sensor for detecting ultraviolet light reflected from the bill. DiBlasio teaches at column 5, lines 5-25 that an ultraviolet sensor is used to detect ultraviolet light reflected from an irradiated document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the sensor 73 in Jones et al's device with the ultraviolet sensor taught by DiBlasio in order to detect ultraviolet light reflected from authentic paper currency since DiBlasio suggests at column 5, lines 21-25 that the wavelength of light emitted from an authentic piece of paper currency is different from the wavelength of light emitted from nonauthentic paper currency.

As to claims 2-5, 23-26 and 52-58:

The presence or absence of the reflected light is detected at column 6, lines 38-48.

As to claims 6 and 27:

Serial Number: 08/317,349

-4-

Art Unit: 2606

Jones et al teaches at column 6, lines 15-25 that the document is United States currency.

As to claims 7 and 28:

Jones et al teaches filter 74 for filtering the reflected light (see column 5, lines 34-42).

As to claim 10 and 32:

Jones et al teaches at column 5, lines 34-42 that the pass band of the filter is quite narrow, thus the filter is not sensitive to light having wavelength much longer than 450 nm which meets the claim limitation.

As to claim 50:

Jones et al further teaches means for selectively activating the device (col. 5, lines 3-17).

4. Claims 8-9 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jones et al [U. S. Pat. No. 4,114,804] cited by Applicant in view of DiBlasio [U. S. Pat. No. 4,313,598] as applied to claims 1-7, 10, 22-28, 32 and 52-59 above, and further in view of Cooper et al [U. S. Pat No. 3,618,765].

The combination of Jones et al and DiBlasio discloses the claimed invention except for the filter which filters out light having wavelength longer than 400 nm. The ultraviolet sensor taught by DiBlasio inherently includes a filter to pass ultraviolet light, although DiBlasio does not specify wavelength

Serial Number: 08/317,349

-5-


Art Unit: 2606

ranges of the ultraviolet light. The wavelength ranges of the ultraviolet light is well known in the art as evidenced by Cooper et al. Copper et al teaches that it is known to provide a filter for filtering out light having wavelength longer than 400 nm to a counterfeit currency detector as set forth at column 2, lines 4-9. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the filter as taught by Cooper et al in the ultraviolet sensor taught by DiBlasio in order to pass ultraviolet light to the counterfeit currency detector.

5. Claims 11-21, 33-49 and 51 are allowable over the prior art of record.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4861.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8576.


P. Tran

April 26, 1996


LEO BOUDREAU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2600